

REMARKS

Claims 36-38 are pending and are rejected under 35 USC §102b over the reference of Cavers U.S. Patent No. 5,489,875.

OBJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102b

Claims 36-38 are each independent claims and are objected as anticipated by Cavers. Each of the pending claims 36-38 has been amended to further clarify and define the claimed invention. The Applicant asserts that the pending claims are not anticipated by the Cavers reference, as that reference does not teach each and every one of the elements recited in the claim as is required for anticipation under §102(b).

Turning specifically to the Cavers reference, that reference is discussed significantly throughout the pending application and is specifically discussed in the Background section of the current application. The present invention is directed to proving reliability of the adaptation of linearizers as noted on page 8 of the application. The Cavers reference discusses decorrelation in the use of common mode and differential mode in a signal adjuster, there is no discussion or teaching with respect to an invention as recited in the claims utilizing an inverted signal correlation matrix that has components derived from pairwise bandpass correlations between the M monitor signals in order to determine M uncorrelated adjustment settings. Accordingly, the Cavers reference falls short of anticipating the pending claims.

Each of claims 36, 37 and 38 have been amended accordingly to recite the determination of M uncorrelated adjustment settings utilizing the inverted signal correlation matrix as claimed. Accordingly, all of claims 36-38 are not anticipated by Cavers and are allowable over the cited art.

The Examiner refers to independent settings within two different complex gain adjusters that may be independent of each other as teaching the recited M uncorrelated adjustment settings. Specifically, the Examiner cites to Column 7, lines 60-64 of Cavers. However, from that teaching within Cavers as well the text within the specification, Applicant asserts that such independent adjustment of the complex gain adjusters, even if asserted to be “uncorrelated adjustment settings” by the Examiner (which it is not), still does not teach the invention as recited utilizing a matrix having components of derived from pairwise bandpass correlations between M monitor signals.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Applicant asserts that the pending claims are in an allowable form and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience. If any issues remain in the application which require additional attention, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicant's undersigned representative to discuss any further amendments which might be handled with an Examiner's amendment.

The Applicants know of no other fees due herein with this submission. However, if any additional charges or credits are necessary, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

/Kurt A. Summe/

Kurt A. Summe

Reg. No. 36,023

2700 Carew Tower
Cincinnati OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 421-7269 (facsimile)